Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/537,641	SAUER ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
ANTHONY SHUMATE	1797	

	ANTHONY SHUMATE	1797		
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress	
THE REPLY FILED 27 July 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP	LICATION IN CONDITION FOR AL	LOWANCE.		
 M The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apple for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 Coperiods: 	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, v with 37 CFR 41.31; o	which places the r (3) a Request	
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.				
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire it.	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth i			
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).			
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patient term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL.	tension and the corresponding amount of shortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing date	of the fee. The appropri- nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee te action; or (2) as	
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed w 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	s of the date of e appeal. Since a	
<u>AMENDMENTS</u>	,			
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, (a) They raise new issues that would require further co (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo 	nsideration and/or search (see NOT		cause	
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or		lucing or simplifying t	he issues for	
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE:	corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.		
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1.	21. See attached Notice of Non-Cor	mpliant Amendment (PTOL-324).	
 Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s) 				
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). 	lowable if submitted in a separate, t	imely filed amendmer	nt canceling the	
 For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: 		l be entered and an e	xplanation of	
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:				
Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:				
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE				
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 				
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome all rejections under appea	l and/or appellant fail	s to provide a	
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatio REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.	
The request for reconsideration has been considered bu See Continuation Sheet.	t does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:	
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). 13. Other:	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)			
(DUANE CMITH)				

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1797

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: serious consideration was provided and SCHULTINK (EP 960645) teaches at figure 85 and table 6a a layered construction with the layers of spunbon welblown and special filter paper which is similar to the layered construction at figure 6 of spunbond, meltblown and special filter paper. Also, SCHULTINK teaches at figure 8E and table 5a that the spunbond layer 53 has a pore diameter MFP 02.343 µm. (Additionally, HOCHE) tel at (US 2008/0011034 A1) provides extrinsic evidence at paragraph 70 that MFP is average Mean Flow Pore Size.] Moreover, an average pore size of 23.43 µm. (Ann 50 µm.)

Also, the Applicant argues that SCHULTINK teaches no paper layers as defined in Applicants' specification. This argument contradicts the Applicants' description in the instant specification at paragraph 45. The instant specification at paragraph 45 describes, "Alternatively or additionally, the filter structure can comprise a high dust holding capacity paper as disclosed in EP 0960645" (i.e. SCHULTINK). (emphasis added) Additionally, the Examiner notes that paragraph 45 of the instant specification does not define paper layers. Though the instant specification at paragraph 45 of ose sexplain the term "non-woven."